

## COMMUNITY SCORECARD

### *Evaluation of the level of the community involvement and participation in the Civil Society Organizations projects planning, implementation and evaluation*

#### I. Introduction

An organization is successful when it is working as close as possible with the community members/constituency and the interests and needs of the beneficiaries guide the functioning of a civil society organization (CSO). This fact was demonstrated in the Republic of Moldova as well as in other countries worldwide. To identify the constituency issues when a project/program starts, as during the implementation as when it is end, the CSOs practice various methods of diagnostic, one of these, widely used within many countries, is the Community Scorecard (CSC). The CSC is a tool for evaluation of the level of the community involvement and participation in the CSOs project planning, implementation and evaluation. This version of the CSC (developed by MPSCS<sup>1</sup>) is an improved draft of the older version developed by FHI 360 within its previous civil society strengthening program (MCSSP<sup>2</sup>).

#### **WHAT is NOT part of the Community Score Card?**

- It is NOT about finger pointing or blaming;
- It is NOT designed to settle personal scores;
- It is NOT supposed to create conflict

The CSC appears as an important part of the organizational process in order to consolidate the good governance of CSO, support Moldovan CSOs in conducting strategic and sustainable project management and consolidate the good governance of CSOs ensuring greater accountability towards their constituency. The relevance, benefits and the necessary actions to apply, monitor and evaluate the sustainability of the projects/programs of a CSO through CSC tool are combined in the following chart.

**Table 1: General relevance, benefits and actions of the implementation of a CSC**

Relevance	Benefits	Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Beneficiaries assess the CSO activities</li> <li>- CSO reviews its strategy in planning for other projects</li> <li>- Organization has a tool to measure and later assess its strategic plan</li> <li>- The organization could change the tool to align each area of the CSO with the overall strategic objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Personnel aware that strategic planning is more significantly if starts with an direct input from the community</li> <li>- CSO builds the confidence of its projects within the community</li> <li>- The CSO obtains an unitary monitoring process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Involve the CSO team in strategic planning</li> <li>- Obtain the community input for planning</li> <li>- Include the CSC in the strategic planning</li> <li>- Analyze, measure, monitor and assess the CSO's programs using CSC</li> </ul>

#### II. The concept of the CSC

The Community Score Card is a monitoring and evaluation approach that enables beneficiary community members to assess service providers and to rate their services/performance using a grading system in the form of scores. It is an instrument to exert public accountability especially at the local level. It is generally of more use in a rural setting. It is used to solicit constituents' perceptions on quality and satisfaction of activities/projects, transparency and general performance of the CSO in order to pinpoint defects and omissions both in the beginning, during and in the end of each activity. The CSO strategizes the external communication (please see the box) to collect the information. It reveals some of the knowledge gaps of the community members themselves too so that strategies would be found to fill those gaps.

#### **Illustrative examples of strategizing external communication**

- Open Doors Day
- Neighborhood meetings
- Events to promote projects
- Meetings to collect the feedback from the community
- Activities to build the dialog with stakeholders and the CSO's credibility.

<sup>1</sup> **Moldova Partnerships for Sustainable Civil Society** (MPSCS) is a five-year (2013-2018) project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and implemented by FHI 360. The purpose of the project is to improve the capacity of Moldovan civil society to represent citizen's interests, influence policymaking, and sustain the sector's democratic role for the future. For more information please visit [www.fhi360.md](http://www.fhi360.md)

<sup>2</sup> **Moldova Civil Society Strengthening Program** (MCSSP) was a four-year effort (2009-2013) funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and implemented by FHI 360. The purpose of the program was to strengthen representative democracy in Moldova through support for a constituent-driven, financially viable civil society sector.

### III. The scorecard structure

The CSOs can use the CSC for various goals such as design, evaluation and monitoring of advocacy campaigns and watchdogging efforts, social services, health programs etc. The tool is broken into three parts each of them requests a series of actions from the CSO and the community/stakeholders/constituents.

**Table 2: The Community Scorecard structure and the both CSO and beneficiaries actions**

No.	Category	CSO's actions	Community/beneficiaries actions
1	<i>Prior to Project</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explain the project</li> <li>- Collect information</li> <li>- Ensure a participatory problem analysis</li> <li>- Mobilize constituents</li> <li>- Create premises for partnerships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analyze the information</li> <li>- Give feedback</li> <li>- Explain the problems</li> <li>- Offer support</li> <li>- Join/refuse collaboration</li> </ul>
2	<i>During Project</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain community involvement</li> <li>- Constantly consult the community</li> <li>- Analyze the feedback</li> <li>- Directly involve the community in the actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support, direct and redirect the CSO, if needed</li> <li>- Directly participate in the actions</li> <li>- Consult the CSO if required</li> </ul>
3	<i>After Project</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Measure the impact of the project</li> <li>- Compare the expectations with the results</li> <li>- Appreciate the level of collaboration and the level of involvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appreciate the influence of the project within the community</li> <li>- Estimate the impact of the project</li> <li>- Analyze the required involvement of the community</li> </ul>

### IV. Methodology of application

The methodology of CSC application contains six general steps, which the organization should go through to better conduct the CSC exercise. The CSO establishes itself all components such as period, internal or external expert, time and other important conditions to conduct CSC, as follows:

**Table 3: The steps, criteria and actions to be done when applying CSC**

No	Steps	General criteria to proceed (CSO side)	Expected results
0	Preparing for the evaluation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- outline the CSO's objectives to use CSC (when, where, how, potential groups)</li> <li>- establish the best period to apply CSC (during strategic planning)</li> <li>- select the responsible for the process</li> <li>- determine the profile of a potential focus group facilitator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSO is acquainted with terms and conditions of applying CSC</li> <li>- the organization has a profile for a potential facilitator</li> <li>- the responsible for the CSC process is appointed</li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b> The CSO itself establishes the group members, geographical area, time and conditions to conduct CSC exercise. All of these should be selected carefully in order to meet the commitments and answer to project needs. The preparation should include a large information process to avoid any fears or misunderstandings within the community members.			
1	Selection a facilitator to conduct focus groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identify a person from inside or outside of the organization, who is not involved in the project;</li> <li>- establish the general public, who will be involved and orient the profile/role for potential candidates;</li> <li>- test the candidates (simulation of the evaluation);</li> <li>- explain the CSC tool if needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- facilitator is as much as possible appropriate to the group (age, gender, discussion style);</li> <li>- facilitator knows how to involve each person in a discussion and how to collect the feedback;</li> <li>- s/he has analytical skills for processing data;</li> <li>- s/he has experience to conduct focus-groups</li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b> The CSO has complete freedom who will be selected as facilitator. As a general recommendation the facilitator to be a member, who is not directly involved in managing the evaluated project. The facilitator should be able to meet the profile, be experienced to conduct focus groups and process the data.			
2	Preparing the facilitator and detailed planning of the evaluation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- establish the geographical area of CSC application;</li> <li>- set up the potential focus-groups (segregation by age, sex, rural/urban etc.);</li> <li>- go through the expectations, project and community issues;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- area is selected in accordance with CSO's area of activity;</li> <li>- focus-groups are selected and divided according to CSO and community priorities and expected results;</li> <li>- the expectation and project issues are clear;</li> </ul>

	(together with the facilitator)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- prepare the announcements/logistics and select the participants for focus-groups;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the community, stakeholders and constituents are prepared for the exercise</li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b> The CSO will pass directly to the process of preparing the facilitator, responsible person and other involved individuals. At this stage, the CSO works under the detailed planning of the evaluation and outline the peculiarities.			
3	Conducting the evaluation based on the CSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- explain the goal of the exercise, conditions and time to filling out the CSC;</li> <li>- support the focus-group participants to fulfill CSCs;</li> <li>- identify the doubters from group members and work additional with them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- focus groups are divided based on the needs;</li> <li>- participants understand and fulfill CSCs, respect time and conditions;</li> <li>- doubters were identified and directed to express their own opinion</li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b> The CSO should establish the group size. The facilitator should provide a detailed explanation of the exercise and identify the doubters, who could compromise the results. The facilitator has to verify the doubters' answers. The CSO must be prepared for any questions and clarifications.			
4	Processing the collected data and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- develop a matrix to record scores from all the focus groups (please see the annex 2);</li> <li>- consolidate the scores and obtain the general results under CSCs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- data are processed in an accurate manner;</li> <li>- the results are obtained and scores are consolidated;</li> <li>- the first draft of the report is developed</li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b> The annex 2 is an example of the matrix to record scores. The CSO should develop its own matrix according to their groups' components. The report should include the description of all taken steps, challenges and conclusions.			
5	Discussing findings and planning for actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- discuss the challenges with CSOs members;</li> <li>- establish the identified issues</li> <li>- design the working chart (matrix of an action plan)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the report on the stage done</li> <li>- the action plan is drafted (please see the annex 3)</li> <li>- the CSO team is acquainted with further stages/actions</li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b> Based on the report, the organization develops the action plan, includes and/or modifies the strategic plan and works for further implementation of the project/program. The annex three is an example, which could be modified as needed.			
6	Consulting constituents and bring them to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- share with representatives from focus-groups the results;</li> <li>- establish the representativeness of the results;</li> <li>- discuss the challenges with group members, write all the reasons and validate the results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the issues are prioritized by the community members;</li> <li>- constituents draft an action plan;</li> <li>- constituents are involved in the implementation of the action plan</li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b> The CSO should involve the community members (constituents, stakeholders, LPA) in data processing to prove the importance of their feedback. This stage is available for the CSOs with highly performance able to work very close with the community. It is not mandatory for the developing CSOs			

Excepting the first stage (selection of a facilitator) and the sixths, CSO should follow the realization of stages 2-5 before, during and after project. The CSO decides itself how often conduct the exercise during the project and how to involve community members, how to modify the strategic plan and the tool itself. In the end of the project, the organization could come with an official report on actions done.

**Community Score Card**  
**FIRST STAGE: PRIOR TO PROJECT**  
*Review of Completed Project*

Name of CSO: \_\_\_\_\_ " \_\_\_\_\_ " Project title: \_\_\_\_\_ " \_\_\_\_\_ "

Start Date: \_\_\_\_\_ End Date: \_\_\_\_\_

The scale of assessment varies from 1 to 5, with 1 being the weakest feedback and 5 representing the highest in positive attitudes (1 - Very Bad; 2 – Bad; 3 - Not enough information; 4 – Strong; 5 - Very Strong). Then at the end, there is a place for comments. The comments are divided in two parts: 1 – general feedback and 2 – the additional information required for this subject.

While the evaluation takes places after a project's conclusion, it is important to find out community response to the process before and during the project itself. Ideally, this card could be split into three sections and CSOs could conduct three different evaluation in time with the project's development, implementation, and afterwards. For now, it can be used to evaluate all three at the conclusion. The subcategories are aimed to allow for both general and specific feedback.

Indicators	Score					Supporting QUESTIONS (for facilitator)
	1	2	3	4	5	
<b>Community Outreach</b>	<i>This section is used to measure how involved with the community the CSO was prior to the project in both creating and promoting the project</i>					
Pre Project Community Needs Assessment						✓ Did you (the community members) see or participate in any kind of needs assessment done by the CSO before the project? What do you think about them? ✓ Was there any type of input collected or data gather that you are aware of? Could you provide any examples? ✓ Did CSO collect any data on community needs, community services, services delivery or anything else? What data do you consider more important?
Project Promotion						✓ To what degree and how well was the project promoted within the community prior to the implementation? ✓ Did you find out about it prior to the implementation? ✓ What sources of media did you heard to promote it?
Project explanation						✓ How well was the project explained to you (community) prior to implementation? ✓ Did you (the community) understand what the project was, whom it would affect, and what the purpose of it was? ✓ How well did you understand what the project is supposed to be doing for the community?
Involvement during planning						✓ How much were you (the community) approached and/or involved with the planning of the project? ✓ Were there at least specific community members brought in for the planning of the project? ✓ Were you involved in planning of all project stages?
Input valued and changes made based on it						✓ Was there any community engagement prior to project implementation? ✓ Did the input seem valuable to the CSO and did you (the community) see any changes made because of that input?



## Moldova Partnerships for Sustainable Civil Society



						✓ Did you suggest any change that was made or asking for the inclusion of something important that the CSO honored?
<b>Additional Feedback (please mention anything you consider important to express and/or valuable for CSO):</b>						
<b>The additional information required on the subject:</b>						
<b>Awareness</b>	<i>This section is used to measure the [impact/profile/image] of CSO before the project</i>					
CSO was present in community						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Were you (the community) aware of this CSO before the project was implemented and to what degree?</li> <li>➤ Did you previously heard about or were involved in any activities of this CSO?</li> <li>➤ How well could you appreciate the programs/projects of this CSO?</li> </ul>
Community knew what resources or services CSO provided						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Do you know services provided by the CSO?</li> <li>➤ Did you recommend these services to other?</li> <li>➤ Did you (and/or people you know directly) benefit from these services?</li> </ul>
Community often utilized resources or services provided by the CSO						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How much did you (the community) benefit from the services provided by the CSO?</li> <li>➤ How often did you utilize the services of CSO?</li> </ul>
Community finds relevant the resources or services CSO provided						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How often did you feel that your/the community needs and the agenda of CSO are similar? Could you provide any examples?</li> <li>➤ How many times the pressing needs of the community were solved by the CSO? Could you provide any examples?</li> </ul>
<b>Additional feedback (please mention anything you consider important to express and/or valuable for CSO):</b>						
<b>The additional information required by the subject:</b>						
<b>SECOND STAGE: DURING THE PROJECT</b>						
<b>Community Investment</b>	<i>This section is used to measure how much the community was involved with the actual project</i>					
Community participation was high						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Do you see/feel a large engagement within the project?</li> <li>➤ Do you know any individual who was involved within the project?</li> </ul>
Engaged members were likely to tell others about project						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If you were involved in the project, did you tell to somebody about it?</li> <li>➤ Do you know any member of community who participated and disseminated the information about the project?</li> </ul>
New constituency members were gained						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Did community members actively want to take part in the CSO beyond the project, as a result of the project?</li> </ul>



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Moldova Partnerships for Sustainable  
Civil Society



						➤ Was there a mailing list the community members signed up for, a commitment to another project, etc.?
<b>Additional feedback (please mention anything you consider important to express and/or valuable for CSO):</b>						
<b>The additional information required by the subject:</b>						
<b>Project Efficacy</b>	<i>This section is used to evaluate the efficacy of the project itself during it</i>					
Community understood what the project was trying to accomplish						➤ Did you (the community) know what the project was trying to accomplish? ➤ Besides the pre project explanation, did you (the community) see what the goals were during the project? ➤ Did the kind of programs or events put on during the project seem to line up with the expectations that the CSO developed?
Project was well run						➤ Did you (the community members) feel that it was well run? ➤ Could you enumerate what types of things were done in association? ➤ Do you know if the project was done in a timely manner (did they bring in guest speakers, was there a diverse amount of project events, did the project ever lag, stop, or disappear, etc.)?
Project was relevant						➤ How do you think, the project was interesting? Was it address the community issues? ➤ Do you want another similar project to be developed in the community? ➤ Would you like to be involved in a similar project in your community?
Project relayed new information						➤ How do you think, the project educated, raised awareness, provided services, or some other NEW way of providing NEW information to the community? ➤ Did it get feedback to you/the community and provided new information?
The community was positively affected						➤ Did the community feel that the project was a positive force within it? ➤ Could you count some results that you/the community felt? ➤ Did the community environment change in a positive way directly because of the project?
<b>Additional feedback (please mention anything you consider important to express and/or valuable for CSO):</b>						
<b>The additional information required by the subject:</b>						
<b>AFTER PROJECT COMPLETION</b>						
<b>Community Changes</b>	<i>This section is used to evaluate the lasting impacts of the projects</i>					
Goals of project were achieved						➤ Did you (the community) feel that the goals communicated by CSO prior or during the project were achieved?

						➤ Are you able to remember some of the declared objectives?
Members changed because of project						➤ Did the CSO successfully change the members of the communities in perception, education, choices, or action that the members would not be aware of or doing had the project not been done? ➤ Did you feel/see any change in this field because of project?
CSO took action to ask for feedback						➤ Did CSO ask you/the community members for feedback? ➤ Was there any effort by the CSO to get community feedback? ➤ Did you remember the form of the feedback that you provided (interviews, surveys, exit polls)?
<b>Additional feedback:</b>						
<b>The additional information required by the subject:</b>						
<b>CSO Presence</b>	<i>This section is used to evaluate how the CSO was perceived and viewed as valuable once the project finished</i>					
Community interested in planning more projects						➤ Do you/the community feel positively enough towards the CSO? ➤ Are you/the community committed to the CSO doing more projects? ➤ Are you liable to help plan or something else to the CSO?
Engagement with CSO remains steady or increasing						➤ Do you/the community feel more engagement or at least sustained engagement with the CSO? ➤ How much the relationship with the CSO increased? ➤ How much the CSO strengthened its relation with the community members? ➤ Did CSO evaluate the drops in engagement?
Community members feel confident in CSO's ability to meet future needs						➤ Do you/community members feel confident in CSO's ability to meet future needs? ➤ Do you/the community have trust that the CSO will continue to do worthwhile projects that address their needs?
<b>Additional feedback (please mention anything you consider important to express and/or valuable for CSO):</b>						
<b>The additional information required by the subject:</b>						

Annex 2: Example for consolidated scorecard

Indicator	Focus groups*	Catchment 1: Community X/Focus group X	Catchment 2: Community X/Focus group X	Catchment 3: Community X/Focus group X	Consolidated score	Reasons
Indicator	Men					
	Women					
	Boys					
	Girls					
Consolidated Score						<i>At least 50% of the work is done</i>



## Moldova Partnerships for Sustainable Civil Society



Indicator	Men					
	Women					
	Boys					
	Girls					
Consolidated Score						<i>The team is inadequate</i>

\*Please note that the CSO will select the more appropriate groups (segregated by region, sex etc)

*Annex 3: Example of action plan\*\**

Priority theme (list each issue)	Action (activities needed to address the issue)	Who will lead it (name & institution)	With whom (name & institution)	Completion date (be realistic)	Resources (what is needed to do the action)	Notes

\*\*Please note that this action plan is an example. The CSO could develop its own action plan if needed.